DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 472 316 HE 035 590

TITLE	Establishing Performance Indicators To Assess Progress toward Meeting the Goals of "The Illinois Commitment": Final Recommendations. Report of the Performance Indicator Advisory Committee to the Illinois Board of Higher Education.
INSTITUTION	Illinois State Board of Higher Education, Springfield.
PUB DATE	2003-02-04
NOTE	45p.; For the Preliminary Recommendations and Interim Report, see ED 468 165.
PUB TYPE	Reports - Evaluative (142)
EDRS PRICE	EDRS Price MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*Educational Indicators; Educational Objectives; *Higher Education; *Institutional Evaluation; *Performance Based Assessment
IDENTIFIERS	*Illinois

ABSTRACT

This report presents the final recommendations of the Performance Indicator Advisory Committee to the Illinois Board of Higher Education with regard to statewide and common institutional indicators that can be used to assess progress toward meeting the goals of "The Illinois Commitment" for higher education. Also addressed are the Committee's recommendations on a number of implementation issues related to the technical and logistical aspects of establishing performance indicators. Recommendations are presented for each of the six goals of "The Illinois Commitment." In August 2002, the Committee had presented a preliminary report with recommendations on a set of 17 potential statewide indicators and 21 potential common institutional indicators. This final report contains 12 statewide and 15 common institutional indicators based on the preliminary indicators. The recommended indicators for Goal 1 cover the major connections between higher education and the state's economy. Indicators related to Goal 2 focus on current and emerging linkages between higher education and P-12 education in Illinois. Indicators related to goal 3 are those related to access to college and student financial aid. Recommended indicators for Goal 4 related to increasing the number and diversity of students completing postsecondary education in Illinois. Performance indicators recommended for Goal 5 are consistent with efforts to hold students to higher expectations and increased accountability. Recommendations related to Goal 6 support improved productivity, cost effectiveness, and accountability. One appendix shows the recommended indicators in chart form, and the other outlines proposed operational parameters. (SLD)

Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made
from the original document.

ED 472 316

ESTABLISHING PERFORMANCE INDICATORS TO ASSESS PROGRESS TOWARD MEETING THE GOALS OF *THE ILLINOIS COMMITMENT:*

FINAL RECOMMENDATIONS

Report of the Performance Indicator Advisory Committee to the Illinois Board of Higher Education

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

C. Lorton

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

1

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

Presented
February 4, 2003

HE035590

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Table of Contents

Page

Members of the Illinois Board of Higher Education
Performance Indicator Advisory Committee ii

Background and Overview 1

Performance Indicator Policy Framework 1

Performance Indicator Advisory Committee 2

Demonstrating Accountability Within Illinois' System of Higher Education 3

Final Committee Recommendations on Statewide and
Common Institutional Performance Indicators 5

Recommendations on Statewide and Common Institutional Indicators 6

Goal 1 Recommendations 7

Goal 2 Recommendations 8

Goal 3 Recommendations 9

Goal 4 Recommendations 10

Goal 5 Recommendations 11

Goal 6 Recommendations 13

Related Issues 14

Recommendations on Implementation Issues 15

Implementation Issues 15

Recommended Timeline for Implementation 17

Conclusion 18

Appendix A: Recommended Statewide and Common Institutional
Performance Indicators 19

Appendix B: Proposed Operational Parameters 33

Members of the Illinois Board of Higher Education
Performance Indicator Advisory Committee

Dan Layzell (Chair)
Deputy Director for Planning and Budgeting
Illinois Board of Higher Education

Ken Andersen
Chair, IBHE Faculty Advisory Committee
Professor Emeritus, Speech Communication
University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign

Trudy Bers
Senior Director, Research Curriculum &
Planning & Exec. Asst. to the President
Oakton Community College

Steve Bragg
Vice President for Finance and Planning
Illinois State University

Katie Cox
Student Member, IBHE
University of Illinois at Springfield

Jim Elsass
Associate Vice President for Budget
Northwestern University

Bernard M. Ferreri
Assoc. Vice Chancellor for Arts and Sciences
City Colleges of Chicago

Sally Ferguson
Director of Institutional Research
Southern Illinois University at Edwardsville

Chet Gardner
Vice President for Academic Affairs
University of Illinois

Laura P. Hartman
Associate Vice President and Professor of
Business Ethics
DePaul University

Ed Hines
Professor, Education Administration and
Foundations
Illinois State University

Virginia McMillan
Executive Vice President
Illinois Community College Board

Richard Vertrees
Vice President, Finance & Administration
Lincoln Land Community College

Special recognition also goes to Dr. Charles Evans, Associate Vice President for Academic Affairs at the University of Illinois, Dr. Scott Parke, Senior Director for Policy Studies at the Illinois Community College Board, and David Tretter, Vice President of the Federation of Illinois Independent Colleges and Universities for their assistance in this effort.

The Committee would also like to thank the many individuals throughout Illinois who provided thoughtful feedback and suggestions on the preliminary recommendations.

Background and Overview

Developing a set of performance indicators is a critical part of further implementation of *The Illinois Commitment*, and also complements the comprehensive system of accountability mechanisms that have been developed for Illinois' system of higher education over time. In December 2001, the Illinois Board of Higher Education (IBHE) approved a proposed methodology and process regarding the development and implementation of a set of performance indicators to help assess how well Illinois' system of higher education is meeting the six major goals of this plan. The methodology and process are based on several guiding principles, including the following:

- The indicators will be directly linked to the goals of *The Illinois Commitment*.[1]
- There will be three levels of indicators: **statewide indicators** related to Illinois' overall system of higher education; **"common" indicators** for all institutions; and **mission-specific indicators** related to each institution's unique role and mission within the state's system of higher education.
- The indicators will be developed using existing/established data sources, measures, and reporting activities to the extent possible. Further, all efforts will be made to streamline related measures and reporting activities.
- The total number of indicators will be minimized to the extent possible.
- The statewide and "common" institutional indicators will be developed through a highly consultative process, involving the IBHE and members of the Illinois higher education community.
- Each institution will have responsibility for developing and proposing its own goals for each "common" and mission-specific institutional indicator.
- The performance indicators selected will remain in place for several years to allow institutions to identify, implement, and evaluate outcomes and improvement strategies.
- The performance indicators selected will continue to be refined in coming years.

At the outset, it should be emphasized that the purpose for establishing these indicators and the related goal-setting processes is to provide an objective assessment of the progress of Illinois' system of higher education in meeting the overall goals of *The Illinois Commitment* and to identify potential areas for improvement at the state and institutional levels In short, these indicators are a further evolution of accountability reporting that began with the annual results reports in 1999.

Performance Indicator Policy Framework

As described earlier, the **statewide indicators** will pertain to the performance of Illinois' system of higher education as a whole, the **common institutional indicators** will be a common

[1] Can be found at http://www.ibhe.state.il.us/Board/Agendas/1999/February/1999-02-07.pdf.

set of measures reported by all institutions, and the **mission-specific indicators** will be related to each institution's unique role and mission within the state. All three types of indicators will have a direct linkage to the goals of *The Illinois Commitment*. Figure 1 illustrates the indicator framework.

FIGURE 1
POLICY FRAMEWORK FOR PERFORMANCE INDICATORS RELATED TO *THE ILLINOIS COMMITMENT*

The reporting for statewide indicators will focus on aggregate measures at the state and/or sector levels (i.e., state and/or sector totals or averages), while the reporting for common institutional indicators and mission-specific indicators will focus on the institution as the "unit of analysis." IBHE staff will have reporting responsibility for the statewide indicators while institutions will have reporting responsibility for the common institutional indicators and mission-specific indicators. Both the common and mission-specific institutional indicators will be included in each institution's annual results report (institutions were requested to identify a limited number of mission-specific performance indicators as part of their 2002 results report submission.) The common institutional indicators, along with the statewide indicators, will be integrated as part of the statewide results report presented to the IBHE each year.

At the same time, the implementation of these performance indicators likely will result in unforeseen challenges (technical and other), particularly in the early years of reporting. As such, it should be understood and accepted at the outset that this effort will require ongoing refinement as the IBHE and Illinois higher education community develop a base of experience with performance indicator reporting.

Performance Indicator Advisory Committee

A Performance Indicator Advisory Committee comprised of representatives from Illinois public universities, community colleges, and private institutions was established to provide guidance to the IBHE on the development of performance indicators. The charge to the Performance Indicators Advisory Committee is to provide guidance on the development and implementation of recommendations with regard to the "common" and statewide indicators for consideration by the IBHE. The Committee includes 12 representatives from Illinois public universities, community colleges, and private institutions, and is chaired by the IBHE Deputy Director for Planning and Budgeting.

The Committee has met seven times since its inception in January 2002.[2] During that time, the Committee:

- Reviewed and affirmed the proposed guiding principles for developing and implementing performance indicators;
- Reviewed and affirmed the proposed indicator framework;
- Developed preliminary recommendations on potential statewide and common institutional indicators and presented these recommendations to the IBHE in August 2002; and,
- Reviewed input received from various constituencies on the potential statewide and common institutional indicators and developed final recommendations for consideration by the IBHE.

This report presents the final recommendations of the Committee with regard to statewide and common institutional indicators. Also addressed are the Committee's recommendations on a number of implementation issues related to the technical and logistical aspects of establishing performance indicators. Before presenting these recommendations, however, it will be helpful to provide an overview of the current system of accountability processes and mechanisms in place for Illinois' system of higher education, and the expected role of the recommended performance indicators within this context.

Demonstrating Accountability Within Illinois' System of Higher Education

Illinois, unlike many other states, has taken a comprehensive and integrated approach to the development of quality assurance and accountability processes through the leadership of the IBHE in collaboration with the Illinois higher education community. In part, this approach is in recognition that Illinois has one of the largest and most diverse systems of higher education in the nation (ranking fourth among all states in terms of total enrollment and sixth in terms of total degrees awarded), and no one accountability process or mechanism can adequately meet the many and varied needs and requirements of Illinois higher education's multiple constituencies. The following accountability activities regularly occur at the state level:

- **Results Report.** Higher education institutions and agencies annually submit a report to document their distinct contributions to achieving the six statewide goals of *The Illinois Commitment.* From these reports and a variety of other analyses and sources, an annual *Statewide Results Report* is developed by the IBHE documenting higher education's progress in meeting the goals of *The Illinois Commitment* and highlighting where additional improvement is needed.
- **Program Review.** Public colleges and universities engage in regular reviews of academic programs. Existing programs at public universities are reviewed at least once every eight years; new programs are reviewed after three years and then move to an eight-year cycle. Likewise, community college programs are on a five-year review cycle. Programs requiring professional licensure are reviewed in accordance with a three-year cycle until accreditation.

[2]Committee agenda materials are at http://www.ibhe.state.il.us/PerformanceIndicators/default.htm.

- **Budget Development**. The development of annual budget recommendations involves targeting of resources to the state's highest priorities and addressing issues identified through annual results reports. Extensive detailed information is collected as part of this process and provided to the Governor's Office and General Assembly in support of the budget recommendations.

- **Productivity and Accountability.** Goal 6 of *The Illinois Commitment* says, "Illinois colleges and universities will continue to improve productivity, cost-effectiveness, and accountability." Institutions are required to reallocate base budget resources from lower to higher priority programs and services at the rate of one percent annually. As institutions received new funding for salary increases and to address deferred maintenance in recent years, they have been required to match these state monies with internal resources.

Additional accountability mechanisms include the following:

- **Comptroller's Accountability Project.** Illinois public universities, higher education agencies (IBHE, ICCB, and ISAC), and the Illinois Mathematics and Science Academy annually contribute to the Comptroller's Accountability Project, providing detailed information for the annual Service, Efforts, and Accomplishments (SEA) report. Enhancements to these reports have been made annually to provide more comprehensive information on how funds are used by institutions and agencies.

- **Analytical Studies, Research, and Reports.** A number of analytical studies are conducted throughout the year by the IBHE, including an instructional cost analysis, a comparison of Illinois faculty salaries to faculty salaries at peer institutions throughout the country, a follow-up study of public university baccalaureate degree recipients, an underrepresented groups report, and a shared enrollment survey to review time-to-degree. Likewise, ICCB requires all community colleges to complete an "accountability/program review report" each year, which are then summarized into a statewide "Accountability and Productivity Report." These studies provide a basis upon which to determine progress in meeting various policy objectives.

The IBHE is also currently working with public colleges and universities to ensure that by 2004, every academic program is assessing student learning and is using assessment results to improve programs. All of these processes relate to the six goals of *The Illinois Commitment* and focus on outcomes, while also recognizing the great diversity of institutional missions within Illinois' system of higher education. As important is the fact that these processes are interrelated and focused on determining progress toward the six goals. For example, the academic program review processes include the requirement of assessment of student learning as a review criterion. In turn, the results of academic program reviews, assessment of student learning, common institutional indicators, and mission-specific indicators are to be incorporated as part of each institution's results report.

In short, the development of performance indicators is part of a continuing evolution of a dynamic and multi-faceted approach to demonstrating accountability for Illinois' large and diverse system of higher education. This approach is dynamic in order to remain responsive to the changing needs and requirements of the many external and internal stakeholders served by Illinois' colleges and universities. It is multi-faceted because no one accountability process or mechanism can adequately meet these many (and varied) needs and requirements.

Illinois has received a key piece of external validation that this approach works. In October 2002, the National Center for Public Policy and Higher Education released its second national higher education report card, *Measuring Up 2002*, which grades states in five categories of key higher education performance indicators, including preparation for college, participation, affordability, degree completion, and benefits.[3] The report card ranks Illinois third among all state systems of higher education in the nation, continuing the state's status as one of the most elite higher education systems in the United States. Illinois has been in the top tier of all states on this report card, ranking 1st in 2000 and 3rd in 2002. This honor is a testament to the efforts made within Illinois' system of higher education as well as to the support for higher education provided by the state's citizens and political leaders over time.

Final Committee Recommendations on Statewide and Common Institutional Performance Indicators

This section of the report presents the final recommendations of the Committee to the IBHE on statewide and common institutional indicators. Recommendations on statewide and common institutional indicators are presented for each of the six goals of *The Illinois Commitment*, including the Committee's rationale in selecting the indicators and related comments.

In August 2002, the Committee presented a preliminary report to the IBHE with recommendations on a set of 17 potential statewide indicators and 21 potential common institutional indicators for consideration and discussion by the IBHE and Illinois higher education community. Subsequent to this meeting, the Committee engaged in a comprehensive and systematic process of gathering public feedback on these preliminary recommendations including the following:

- Discussions with Board members;
- Meetings with the IBHE Faculty Advisory Council and Student Advisory Committee;
- Discussions with other appropriate constituency groups including the Chief Academic Officers of Illinois public colleges and universities and the Illinois Association for Institutional Research (IAIR); and,
- A "web survey" of over 800 individuals from throughout the Illinois higher education community and other interested parties on the preliminary recommendations that was completed by 250 respondents.

In developing the final recommendations on statewide and common institutional indicators, the Committee attempted to balance comprehensiveness in coverage with the guiding principle of minimizing the total number of indicators adopted within the context of the input provided on the preliminary recommendations. This was not an easy task given the complexity of Illinois' system of higher education and the multi-dimensionality of the goals of *The Illinois Commitment*. However, as highlighted earlier, the Committee also recognized that the performance indicators will be an important complement to the many and varied accountability

[3] The full 2002 report card can be found on the National Center's web site, www.highereducation.org.

mechanisms in place at the state level for Illinois colleges and universities, and as such the indicators do not need to be "all things to all people."

Recommendations on Statewide and Common Institutional Indicators

The 12 statewide and 15 common institutional indicators recommended for the six goals of *The Illinois Commitment* are presented in Figures 2 through 7 on the following pages. As noted earlier, IBHE staff will have reporting responsibility for the statewide indicators, while institutions will have reporting responsibility for the common institutional indicators. The recommended common institutional indicators will apply to all Illinois institutions of higher education (public and private) unless otherwise noted. A more detailed description of the recommended indicators, including the rationale for including each indicator, the basis for measurement, the basis for assessing performance, whether the related data are collected regularly, and likely data source(s) is included in Appendix A. A proposed set of operational parameters developed by the Committee for many of the indicators is included in Appendix B.

As indicated in Appendix A, data are already collected for many of the indicators through existing sources. However, there are some areas, particularly with regard to Goals 2, 3, and 5, for which current data systems either do not exist or are inadequate for the recommended indicators. The Committee recognizes that enhanced or new data collection efforts will take time to implement but will ultimately result in more useful information for accountability reporting.

Goal 1: Higher Education Will Help Illinois Business and Industry Sustain Strong Economic Growth

The Committee's final recommendations on statewide and common institutional indicators related to Goal 1 are shown in Figure 2. The recommended indicators related to Goal 1 cover the major connections between higher education and the state's economy, including providing individuals with the education and training to meet Illinois' workforce needs, providing training and professional development opportunities for Illinois employers and employees, and research and development activities (basic and applied). All of these efforts contribute to the goal of helping Illinois business and industry sustain strong economic growth. It should also be recognized that the teaching, research, and service contributions of Illinois colleges and universities also have many impacts beyond the borders of the state (economic and otherwise), given the increasingly global nature of the economy.

FIGURE 2
RECOMMENDED STATEWIDE AND COMMON INSTITUTIONAL INDICATORS RELATED TO GOAL 1

Statewide Indicators	Common Institutional Indicators
➢ Satisfaction of Illinois business and industry with Illinois higher education ➢ Annual sponsored research expenditures ➢ Annual number of graduates by level and broad field of study	➢ Percent of degree/certificate recipients either employed or enrolled in further education within one year of graduation ➢ Description of Effective Practices: Collaborative Activities with Business and Industry (*Examples*): ▪ Formalized training programs ▪ Continuing professional education ▪ Cooperative work-study programs ▪ External advisory councils for degree programs ▪ Research partnerships with business and industry ▪ Economic development partnerships with local and/or state governments

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Goal 2: Higher Education Will Join Elementary and Secondary Education to Improve Teaching and Learning at All Levels

The Committee's final recommendations on statewide and common institutional indicators related to Goal 2 are shown in Figure 3. The recommended indicators related to Goal 2 focus on current and emerging linkages between higher education and P-12 education in Illinois. These indicators focus on the quality and supply of teacher preparation programs, graduates, and services provided by institutions to practicing educators (teachers and administrators) across Illinois. All of these are necessary factors in improving teaching and learning at the elementary and secondary levels. The Committee also recognizes the importance of the many statewide initiatives currently underway to improve the quality and supply of teachers in meeting Goal 2. These initiatives include the recently adopted legislation requiring students to pass the state teacher basic skills competency test before admission to a baccalaureate teacher education program in Illinois, and the requirement that all teacher education programs in Illinois ultimately incorporate and be evaluated against National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE) standards to assure program quality.

FIGURE 3
RECOMMENDED STATEWIDE AND COMMON INSTITUTIONAL INDICATORS RELATED TO GOAL 2

Statewide Indicators	Common Institutional Indicators
➢ Annual number of students completing requirements for initial teacher certification by race/ethnicity and gender by certificate area	➢ Annual number of students completing requirements for initial teacher certification by certificate area [#] ➢ Description of Effective Practices: Strategies to Foster P-16 Partnerships (*Examples*): ▪ Formalized partnerships with P-12 schools and school districts ▪ Teacher endorsement content training for P-12 teachers ▪ Professional development to P-12 teachers and administrators as an ISBE registered provider ▪ Collaboration with P-12 schools and school districts on recruitment and retention of new teachers ▪ Collaboration with P-12 schools and school districts on professional development for teachers and administrators

[#] Only applies to institutions with teacher education programs.

Goal 3: No Illinois Citizen Will Be Denied an Opportunity For a College Education Because of Financial Need

The Committee's final recommendations on statewide and common institutional indicators related to Goal 3 are shown in Figure 4. This goal is perhaps the most difficult to measure of all six goals. However, it is possible to make an assessment on whether related trends (i.e., costs of attendance and financial aid) run counter to the goal of reducing financial impediments to a college education, which is the rationale behind the selection of these potential indicators. Also included in the indicators is an assessment of the remaining financial need at various student and family income levels after federal, state, and institutional grant aid is subtracted. This is a measure of affordability for students of various economic backgrounds. The Committee recognizes that these measures represent just a beginning in developing reliable and meaningful indicators regarding college affordability. In addition, the work of the current Committee on Affordability will result in recommendations on strategies and actions related to this goal.

FIGURE 4
RECOMMENDED STATEWIDE AND COMMON INSTITUTIONAL INDICATORS RELATED TO GOAL 3

Statewide Indicators	Common Institutional Indicators
➢ Average undergraduate tuition and fees vs. Illinois per capita disposable income (by sector) ➢ Proportion of enrolled undergraduate students who receive financial aid by type of aid and overall (by sector) ➢ Net price of attendance for undergraduates who apply for aid by income quintile, after MAP, Pell, SEOG, and institutional grant aid are subtracted (by sector)[#]	➢ Net price of attendance for undergraduates who apply for aid by income quintile, after MAP, Pell, SEOG, and institutional grant aid are subtracted[#] ➢ Description of Effective Practices: Institutional strategies to address student unmet financial need (*Examples*): ▪ Institutional grant/gift aid for needy students ▪ Institutional loan forgiveness programs ▪ Campus employment ▪ Cooperative work-study programs ▪ Deferred tuition payment plans

[#]The "net price" reflects the total cost of attendance for a student at an institution as determined by the institution for use in making financial aid awards to undergraduates, including tuition and fees, housing (e.g., room and board), transportation, books, and supplies.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Goal 4: Illinois Will Increase the Number and Diversity of Citizens Completing Training and Education Programs

The Committee's final recommendations on statewide and common institutional indicators related to Goal 4 are shown in Figure 5. The recommended indicators for Goal 4 relate not only to the stated goal of increasing the number and diversity of individuals completing postsecondary education programs in Illinois, but also the equally important strategies that are in place to facilitate that goal at the institutional level. A related and important source of information on attainment of this goal is the annual Underrepresented Groups Report.

FIGURE 5
RECOMMENDED STATEWIDE AND COMMON INSTITUTIONAL INDICATORS RELATED TO GOAL 4

Statewide Indicators	Common Institutional Indicators
➢ Completions by race/ethnicity, disability status, and gender (by level and sector)#	➢ Completions by race/ethnicity, disability status, and gender (by level)# ➢ Description of Effective Practices: Institutional Strategies to Increase the Number and Diversity of Students Completing Academic Programs (*Examples*): ▪ Academic support services (e.g., tutoring, supplemental instruction) ▪ Student support services (e.g., counseling, career services) ▪ Institutional diversity policy ▪ Institutional diversity office/coordinator ▪ Institutional diversity committee ▪ Institutional office for international students/coordinator ▪ Institutional office for students with disabilities/coordinator

#Includes both the number and relative proportion of completions by race/ethnicity, disability status, and gender.

Goal 5: Illinois Colleges and Universities Will Hold Students to Even Higher Expectations for Learning and Will be Accountable for the Quality of Academic Programs and the Assessment of Learning

The Committee's final recommendations on statewide and common institutional indicators related to Goal 5 are shown in Figure 6. The intent of this goal is for all Illinois institutions to have in place a systematic assessment process to determine what students know and are able to do as a result of completing a unique program of study. In turn, these assessment results must be used to improve the quality of teaching and student learning. This is consistent with national trends in academic quality assurance. In recent years, regional accrediting bodies for colleges and universities such as the North Central Association (the accrediting body for colleges and universities in Illinois) have turned to formalizing the assessment of student learning outcomes and have identified the assessment process as a necessary element of quality and public accountability.

The recommended performance indicators related to Goal 5 are consistent with these efforts. For the statewide indicator, Illinois is one of five states that have been asked to participate in a National Forum on College-Level Learning, funded by the Pew Charitable Trusts to develop a test model for collecting and addressing comparable college-level learning information across states for the purpose of benchmarking.[4] The results from this pilot project will be available in 2004 (and included in *Measuring Up 2004*), and will be a first step toward having comparable state-level student learning outcome data, should Illinois finalize its participation in this project. The common institutional indicators will provide supporting evidence on the views of alumni and the performance of students on selected licensure examinations.

The Committee also recognizes that the IBHE's current efforts related to the development and implementation of assessment plans for general education and all undergraduate and graduate programs, in collaboration with public colleges and universities across the state, are a primary component in achieving Goal 5. The inclusion of student assessment results in institutional results reports (after 2004) will provide a wealth of information on student learning outcomes to complement these indicators.

[4] See Appendix B (page 40) for a more detailed description of this pilot project.

FIGURE 6
RECOMMENDED STATEWIDE AND COMMON INSTITUTIONAL INDICATORS RELATED TO GOAL 5

Statewide Indicators	Common Institutional Indicators
➢ State level results from Illinois' participation in National Forum on College-Level Learning pilot project on assessment of college student learning (*available in 2004*)	➢ Extent to which institutional quality and effectiveness are recognized by graduates through alumni surveys ➢ Pass rates on professional/occupational licensure exams relative to state and/or national averages ➢ Description of Effective Practices: Institutional Commitment to Academic Quality and Assessment (*Examples*): ▪ Institution-wide use of assessment results to improve program quality. ▪ Formalized end of program assessments for academic programs

Goal 6: Illinois Colleges and Universities Will Continually Improve Productivity, Cost-Effectiveness, and Accountability

The Committee's final recommendations on statewide and common institutional indicators related to Goal 6 are shown in Figure 7. At a broad level, achievement of Goal 6 is a natural result of achievement of the previous five goals. If Illinois' colleges and universities are adequately addressing Goals 1 through 5, improved productivity, cost-effectiveness, and accountability should follow. However, the Committee also recognizes that the implied focus of this goal is fiscal and programmatic accountability. Thus, the recommended indicators for Goal 6 address the stated goals of productivity and cost-effectiveness from both an instructional and administrative perspective. On the instructional side, the recommended indicators include both cost and outcome measures. On the administrative side, the data will provide information on institutional resources devoted to administrative operations at public colleges and universities.

FIGURE 7
RECOMMENDED STATEWIDE AND COMMON INSTITUTIONAL INDICATORS RELATED TO GOAL 6

Statewide Indicators	Common Institutional Indicators
➢ Cost of instruction per credit hour by student level: sector averages#	➢ Cost of instruction per credit hour by student level and as a percent of weighted sector average by level#
➢ Percent of first-time, full-time degree-seeking freshmen who complete their degree within 150% of catalog time, or are still enrolled or transferred: range by sector.	➢ Administrative and support cost per credit hour (all levels) and as a percent of sector average#
➢ Administrative and support cost per credit hour (all levels): sector averages#	➢ Percent of first-time, full-time degree-seeking freshmen who complete their degree within 150% of catalog time, or are still enrolled or transferred.
	➢ Description of Effective Practices: Administrative and Academic Productivity Enhancements Adopted by the Institution (*Examples*) ▪ Administrative cost reductions and efficiencies ▪ Implementation of four-year graduation guarantees

#Applies only to public universities and community colleges.

Related Issues

"Descriptions of Effective Practices" as Performance Indicators. For all goals, the common institutional indicators include "descriptions of effective practices" related to the stated goal, and include some possible examples of institutional strategies or activities that may be an "effective practice" area. While not a quantitative measure *per se*, such strategies or activities should be in place at the institutional level for the desired outcome to be achieved. This is an outgrowth of the current requirement that institutions submit two such examples (one administrative and one academic) as part of their annual results report. The Committee believes that these examples can serve a dual role by promoting institutional accountability and also creating a central source of effective strategies that can be used by all institutions throughout Illinois.

These "effective practices" will need to be concisely presented (one page maximum), with institutions selecting no more than one example per goal area. The presentation should include the following elements:

- A description of the "effective practice"
- A statement of justification for why it is an "effective practice"
- The results of the "effective practice" for the reporting year (quantified if at all possible)

Given differences in individual institutional priorities, institutions do not need to submit an example for every goal every year, but should plan to submit effective practices for at least two goals per year. The IBHE may also want to designate one specific goal each year that all institutions submit effective practices for (on a rotating basis) as a means of providing focus.

The Importance of Context in Reporting Performance Indicators. Colleges and universities, like other organizations, are affected in many ways by the demographic, educational, economic, and political environments in which they operate. As such, it is important to recognize that measures of institutional performance will reflect the impact of these environmental dimensions as well. Further, these dimensions can have differential impacts at the state and local levels. For example, aggregate employment needs by occupation at the state level can vary in magnitude at the local labor market level due to natural differences in regional economic emphases across the state. Figure 8 below presents examples of relevant factors within each of these environmental dimensions.

The Committee recommends that the IBHE staff provide meaningful, but focused state-level context in the reporting mechanisms (e.g., results reports) for the performance indicators, indicating the impact and relevance of each of the contextual factors on the performance indicators. It is expected that each institution will also include descriptions of relevant contextual factors in its reporting on common institutional and mission-specific indicators. As with the state-level context, these factors should be focused and concisely presented.

FIGURE 8
EXAMPLES OF ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS IMPACTING HIGHER EDUCATION

Environmental Dimension	Examples of Relevant Factors
Demographic Context	➢ Trends in state population, overall and by race/ethnicity ➢ Socio-economic profile of residents ➢ Trends in the number of Illinois high school graduates
Educational Context	➢ Levels of educational attainment and skill levels of Illinois residents ➢ Educational preparedness of Illinois high school graduates for college-level work.
Economic Context	➢ Trends in employment and unemployment ➢ Employment needs by occupation and industry
Political Context	➢ Financial support provided to Illinois higher education by local, state, and federal governments ➢ The overall policy environment for higher education in Illinois

Importance of Mission Specific Indicators. The mission specific indicators developed by each institution will be extremely important in illustrating each institution's unique contribution to the system in concert with the broader "common institutional indicators." As such, the Committee's approach in developing recommendations for the common institutional indicators was to identify indicators that are universal across Illinois colleges and universities, relying on the mission-specific indicators to highlight the distinctive and unique contributions of each institution and sector. As noted earlier, institutions have begun work on the development of their mission-specific indicators. The Committee recommends that each institution review its efforts to date to ensure that these indicators are not duplicative of the common institutional indicators recommended in this report.

Recommendations on Implementation-Related Issues

Implementation Issues

Equally important to the recommendations on performance indicators are the steps necessary to bring them to fruition. The following are recommended steps by the Committee regarding some key implementation issues.

Resolution of Technical Issues (Operational Definitions and Data Sources) and Timing and Phase-In of Performance Indicators. Once the indicators have been finalized, operational definitions and data sources will need to be determined, particularly for those indicators for which no current data exist. The Committee has already developed a proposed list of operational definitions for many of the indicators (see Appendix B) that can serve as a basis for further discussion and refinement. Further, while the indicators for which data are already available can be implemented immediately, those for which data are not available will take time to bring on-line, although all should be in place for reporting by 2005. Finally, determination will need to be made on the format in which indicators will be presented in both the statewide and institutional results reports. *IBHE staff should take the lead on these activities with input from Committee members and other colleagues throughout the state.*

Institutional Goal-Setting for the Common and Mission-Specific Indicators. As noted at the beginning of this report, the purpose for establishing the indicators is to provide a more empirical assessment of how well Illinois' system of higher education is doing in meeting the overall goals of *The Illinois Commitment*, and to be a part of the broader accountability mechanisms in place for Illinois higher education. A guiding principle of this effort from the start has been that each institution will have the responsibility for developing and proposing goals for the common and mission specific indicators, given that the goals for these indicators should reflect the unique characteristics and mission of each institution, within the broader context of *The Illinois Commitment*.

The Committee believes that the goals set by each institution for common institutional and mission-specific indicators should be rigorous and quantifiable, but also achievable within the context of a balanced institutional approach to "continuous improvement." However, this does not mean that the goals should focus on continuous growth or increase. There should also be a formal "feedback loop" at the state and institutional levels by which the results are used to identify areas of performance in need of improvement and to establish improvement plans. Given that implementation of the indicators will require periodic adjustments, the Committee recommends that the goal-setting and improvement processes allow for periodic refinements in the early years as well.

The Committee recognizes the need to strive for balance in both the goal-setting and feedback/improvement processes across all indicators in order to minimize the potential for "conflicting priorities." Strategies that would improve performance in one area could impede or even reverse progress in other important areas. For example, outcomes such as retention and graduation rates can generally be increased if admissions requirements are raised, but raising admissions requirements can also serve to limit access to higher education. Likewise, increasing undergraduate class size can improve cost efficiency, but can also have a detrimental effect on the quality of undergraduate teaching and learning.

In summary, the goal-setting process should focus on where each institution strives to be across all indicators and not on continuously increasing output or outcomes relative to any one indicator. Further, goal-setting should not be an annual activity since the process of achieving meaningful goals across all indicators transcends a one-year planning horizon. However, once goals are established for each indicator, institutions will likely want to revisit them periodically given the dynamic nature of the environment. *Institutions should begin the goal-setting process immediately, with full involvement of all campus governance groups. Institutions should focus on establishment of goals for the common institutional indicators by 2004, with a status report on these efforts provided to the IBHE in August 2003. Goals for the mission-specific indicators should be established by 2005.*

The Relationship Between Performance Indicator Reporting and Annual Results Reports. The purpose of the annual results report submissions is to document how institutions are addressing and meeting each of the six goals of *The Illinois Commitment*. Thus, a natural evolution is for institutions to use their results report submissions as the medium for reporting the common institutional indicators and mission specific indicators on an annual basis. *When reporting of performance indicators is included in the annual results reports, other reporting requirements will be reduced so as to not expand the burden of reporting and to keep the results reports focused and useful.*

The state-level indicators will then be compiled and reported by IBHE staff in developing the statewide results report, along with a synthesis of the common institutional and mission-

specific indicator results. Given that it will not be feasible to include all institutional responses on the common institutional and mission-specific indicators in the statewide results report, each institution's report (including context, goals, and indicator results) should be posted separately to the IBHE's web site.

Coordination with the Comptroller's Public Accountability Project. As noted earlier in this report, the IBHE coordinates the submission of information from public universities and the Illinois Community College Board to be included as part of the Comptroller's annual SEA report. Comptroller's staff involved in this project are aware of the IBHE's efforts to develop performance indicators and have indicated a willingness to incorporate these efforts into the SEA report in order to avoid duplication and reduce institutional reporting burden. *IBHE staff should begin working immediately with the Office of the Comptroller to develop a plan and timeline for incorporating these performance indicators as part of the SEA report.*

Ongoing Refinement of Performance Indicators. The implementation of the performance indicators ultimately selected likely will result in unforeseen challenges (technical and otherwise), particularly in the early years of reporting. As such, it should be understood and accepted at the outset that this effort will require ongoing refinement as the IBHE and Illinois higher education community develop a base of experience with performance indicator reporting.

The Continued Role of the Advisory Committee in Implementation Activities. *The Committee should remain an active participant in the implementation phase of this effort given the importance of maintaining continuity.*

Recommended Timeline for Implementation

The Committee recommends the following timeline in finalizing these indicators and moving forward with implementation:

- **Spring – Summer 2003**: Technical and operational issues identified and resolved, including a schedule for bringing all indicators "on line." *Institutions begin goal-setting process for common institutional indicators.*

- **August 2003**: *First Reporting Cycle.* Institutional reporting of common and mission-specific indicators for which the required data or information are available in annual results report submissions. *Institutions provide update on goal-setting process.*

- **December 2003**: First report on existing indicators as part of Statewide Results Report, with update on goal-setting process.

- **2004**: *Second Reporting Cycle.* Ongoing refinement and implementation of remaining indicators. *Institutions identify goals for all common institutional indicators and begin goal-setting process for the mission-specific indicators.*

- **2005**: *Third Reporting Cycle.* Further refinement; remaining indicators brought "on line". *Institutions identify goals for their mission-specific indicators.*

There will likely need to be adjustments made to this timeline, particularly after the discussions on technical and operational issues and the first reporting cycle are completed.

Conclusion

The recommendations on performance indicators to assess progress toward meeting the goals of *The Illinois Commitment* included in this report will complement the dynamic and comprehensive accountability processes currently in place for Illinois higher education. Likewise, implementation of these indicators will provide an opportunity for further discussion on the overall goals of *The Illinois Commitment*. Indeed, the very process of developing and refining these recommendations over the past several months has resulted in serious reflection on what the six goals really "mean," what they are intended to achieve, and where further refinements are needed. For example, both Committee members and many individuals who provided input on the preliminary recommendations noted that there is currently no stated goal that "Illinois' system of higher education will help to improve the quality of life for Illinois citizens." As such, the Committee strongly encourages the IBHE to revisit the goals of *The Illinois Commitment* in the future to consider this and other refinements.

It is likely that periodic refinements to the performance indicators will be required as technical, logistical, and other issues arise during implementation. In the end, however, the Committee is confident that the indicators ultimately selected will be a key component in demonstrating accountability to Illinoisans regarding the successes and opportunities for further improvement of their system of higher education in meeting the goals set forth in *The Illinois Commitment*.

APPENDIX A

RECOMMENDED STATEWIDE AND COMMON INSTITUTIONAL PERFORMANCE INDICATORS:

Rationale, Bases for Measurement, Bases for Assessing Performance And Likely Data Sources

RECOMMENDED STATEWIDE AND COMMON INSTITUTIONAL PERFORMANCE INDICATORS

Goal 1: Economic Growth (Statewide)

Indicator	Rationale for Inclusion	Basis of Measurement	Basis for Assessing Performance	Regularly Collected?/ Likely Data Source
Satisfaction of Illinois business and industry with Illinois higher education	A measure of feedback from business and industry within the state on how well Illinois' system of higher education as a whole is meeting the state's needs in the areas of workforce demand, training, and technology transfer.	Both continuous/numeric and dichotomous (e.g., yes/no)	Internal benchmarking	*No - Periodic surveys at the state level*
Annual sponsored research expenditures	A measure of the extent of externally-funded research activities within Illinois' system of higher education.	Continuous/numeric	Both internal benchmarking and external comparisons.	Yes - National Science Foundation annual surveys
Annual number of graduates by level and broad field of study	A measure of the potential supply of college-educated individuals for the state's workforce.	Continuous/numeric	Internal benchmarking	Yes - IPEDS

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Goal 1: Economic Growth (Common Institutional Indicators)

Indicator	Rationale for Inclusion	Basis of Measurement	Basis for Assessing Performance	Regularly Collected?/ Likely Data Source
Percent of degree/certificate recipients either employed or enrolled in further education within one year of graduation	A measure of the relative success of the institution in preparing students to enter the workforce or pursue further specialized education and training.	Continuous/numeric	Internal benchmarking	Yes - Periodic surveys by institutions
Description of Effective Practices: Collaborative Activities with Business and Industry (*Examples*): ▪ Formalized training programs ▪ Continuing professional education ▪ Cooperative work-study programs ▪ External advisory councils for degree programs ▪ Research partnerships with business and industry ▪ Economic development partnerships with local and/or state governments	Reflects the institution's linkage with state and local business, industry, and workforce needs.		Internal benchmarking	*No – Institutions*

Goal 2: Partnerships with P-12 Education (Statewide)

Indicator	Rationale for Inclusion	Basis of Measurement	Basis for Assessing Performance	Regularly Collected?/ Likely Data Source
Annual number of students completing requirements for initial certification by race/ethnicity and gender, by certificate area[5]	A measure of the potential supply of new teachers in Illinois.	Continuous/numeric	Internal benchmarking	Yes - Institutions/ISBE

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

[5] Includes completers of initial certificate programs.

Goal 2: Partnerships with P-12 Education (Common Institutional Indicators)

Indicator	Rationale for Inclusion	Basis of Measurement	Basis for Assessing Performance	Regularly Collected?/ Likely Data Source
Annual number of students completing requirements for initial certification by certificate area[6]	A measure of the potential supply of new teachers produced by the institution.	Continuous/numeric	Internal benchmarking	Yes - Institutions/ISBE
Description of Effective Practices: Institutional Strategies to Foster P-16 Partnerships (*Examples*): ▪ Formalized partnerships with P-12 schools and school districts ▪ Teacher endorsement content training for P-12 teachers ▪ Collaboration with P-12 schools and school districts on recruitment and retention of new teachers ▪ Collaboration with P-12 schools and school districts on professional development for teachers and administrators	Reflects the extent of the institution's linkage with P-12 education in Illinois.	Varied	Internal benchmarking	*No - Institutions*

27

[6] This indicator only applies to institutions with teacher education programs. Includes completers of initial certificate programs.

Goal 3: Affordability (Statewide)

Indicator	Rationale for Inclusion	Basis of Measurement	Basis for Assessing Performance	Regularly Collected?/ Likely Data Source
Average undergraduate tuition and fees vs. Illinois per capita disposable income (by sector)	Measures of the level of financial access to Illinois higher education.	Continuous/numeric	Internal benchmarking	Yes – ISAC, Annual Illinois Student Financial Aid Survey
Proportion of enrolled undergraduate students who receive financial aid by type of aid and overall (by sector)				Yes – Annual Illinois Student Financial Aid Survey
Net price of attendance for undergraduates who receive aid by income quintile, after MAP, Pell, SEOG, and institutional grant awards are subtracted[7] (by sector)				*No – Institutions, ISAC, U.S. Census Bureau*

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

[7]The "net price" reflects the total cost of attendance for a student at an institution as determined by the institution for use in making financial aid awards to undergraduates, including tuition and fees, housing (e.g., room and board), transportation, books, and supplies.

Goal 3: Affordability (Common Institutional Indicators)

Indicator	Rationale for Inclusion	Basis of Measurement	Basis for Assessing Performance	Regularly Collected?/ Likely Data Source
Net price of attendance for undergraduates who apply for aid by income quintile, after MAP, Pell, and institutional grant awards are subtracted.[8]	Indicates the level of financial access to the institution for students.	Continuous/numeric	Both internal benchmarking and external comparisons	*No – Institutions, ISAC, U.S. Census Bureau.*
Description of Effective Practices: Institutional strategies to address student unmet financial need (*Examples*): • Institutional grant/gift aid for needy students. • Institutional loan forgiveness programs • Campus employment • Cooperative work-study programs • Deferred tuition payment plans	Reflects the institution's commitment to enhancing financial access for students.	Varied	Both internal benchmarking and external comparisons	*No – Institutions.*

[8]The "net price" reflects the total cost of attendance for a student at an institution as determined by the institution for use in making financial aid awards to undergraduates, including tuition and fees, housing (e.g., room and board), transportation, books, and supplies.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Goal 4: Access and Diversity (Statewide)

Indicator	Rationale for Inclusion	Basis of Measurement	Basis for Assessing Performance	Regularly Collected?/ Likely Data Source
Completions by race/ethnicity, disability status, and gender (by level and sector)[9]	Reflects the success of Illinois higher education in graduating students from underrepresented groups in particular.	Continuous/numeric	Both internal benchmarking/external comparisons	Yes - IPEDS, Annual Underrepresented Groups Report.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

[9] Includes both the number and relative proportion of completions by race/ethnicity, disability status, and gender.

Goal 4: Access and Diversity (Common Institutional Indicators)

Indicator	Rationale for Inclusion	Basis of Measurement	Basis for Assessing Performance	Regularly Collected?/ Likely Data Source
Completions (number and proportion) by race/ethnicity, disability status, and gender (by level)[10]	Reflects the success of the institution in graduating students from underrepresented groups.	Continuous/numeric	Internal benchmarking	Yes - IPEDS
Description of Effective Practices: Institutional Strategies to Increase the Number and Diversity of Students Completing Academic Programs *(Examples)*: ▪ Has academic support services (e.g., tutoring, supplemental instruction) ▪ Has student support services (e.g., counseling, career services) ▪ Has an institutional diversity policy ▪ Has an institutional diversity office/coordinator ▪ Has an institutional diversity committee ▪ Has an institutional office for international students/coordinator ▪ Has an institutional office for students with disabilities/coordinator	Reflects the institution's commitment to enhancing access and diversity.	Varied	Internal benchmarking	*No - Institutions*

[10]Includes both the number and relative proportion of completions by race/ethnicity, disability status, and gender.

Goal 5: High Quality (Statewide)

Indicator	Rationale for Inclusion	Basis of Measurement	Basis for Assessing Performance	Regularly Collected?/ Likely Data Source
State-level results from Illinois' Participation in National Forum on College-Level Learning Pilot Project on Assessment of College Student Learning (*available in 2004*)	Provides an opportunity for Illinois to participate in this first-ever effort to develop a model for collecting comparable state-level information on college student learning outcomes.	To be determined – in process	To be determined – in process	*No – to be determined*

Goal 5: High Quality (Common Institutional Indicators)

Indicator	Rationale for Inclusion	Basis of Measurement	Basis for Assessing Performance	Regularly Collected?/ Likely Data Source
Extent to which institutional quality and effectiveness are recognized by graduates	Provides the perspective of graduates regarding their educational experience.	Continuous/numeric and dichotomous	Internal benchmarking	Yes – Periodic alumni satisfaction surveys
Pass rates on professional/occupational licensure exams relative to state and/or national averages	A measure of program quality assurance and effectiveness.	Continuous/numeric	Internal benchmarking	In process – Institutions, IL Department of Professional Regulation, Testing agencies
Description of Effective Practices: Institutional Commitment to Academic Quality and Assessment (*Examples*): ▪ Institution-wide use of assessment results to improve program quality ▪ Formalized end of program assessment for all academic programs	Reflects the institution's commitment to academic quality assurance.	Varied	Internal benchmarking	*No – Institutions*

32 BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Goal 6: Productivity and Accountability (Statewide)

Indicator	Rationale for Inclusion	Basis of Measurement	Basis for Assessing Performance	Regularly Collected?/ Likely Data Source
Cost of instruction per credit hour by student level: sector averages[11]	A measure of instructional efficiency over time for public universities and community colleges.	Continuous/numeric	Internal benchmarking	Yes - Annual Public University and Community College Cost Studies
Proportion of first-time, full-time freshmen who complete their degree within 150% of catalog time, or are still enrolled or transferred: sector ranges	A statewide measure of student success.	Continuous/numeric	Internal benchmarking and external comparisons	Yes - NCES Graduation Rate Survey
Administrative and support cost per credit hour (all levels): sector averages[11]	A measure of average administrative and support costs over time by sector.	Continuous/numeric	Internal benchmarking	Yes - Annual Public University and Community College Cost Studies

[11] Includes public universities and community colleges only.

Goal 6: Productivity and Accountability (Common Institutional Indicators)

Indicator	Rationale for Inclusion	Basis of Measurement	Basis for Assessing Performance	Regularly Collected?/ Likely Data Source
Cost of instruction per credit hour by student level and as a percent of sector average by student level[12]	A measure of instructional efficiency over time for the institution.	Continuous/numeric	Internal benchmarking	Yes - Annual Public University and Community College Cost Studies
Administrative and support cost per credit hour and as a percent of sector average[12]	A measure of administrative and support costs over time at the institution.	Continuous/numeric	Internal benchmarking	Yes - Annual Public University and Community College Cost Studies
Proportion of first-time, full-time freshmen who complete their degree within 150% of normal time, or are still enrolled or transferred	A measure of student success.	Continuous/numeric	Internal benchmarking	Yes - NCES Graduation Rate Survey
Description of Effective Practices: Administrative and Academic Productivity Enhancements Adopted by the Institution (Examples): ▪ Administrative cost reductions and efficiencies. ▪ Implementation of four-year graduation guarantees.	Illustrates efforts taken by the institution to improve productivity and efficiency.	Varied	Internal benchmarking	*No - Institutions*

[12]Includes public universities and community colleges only.

34 BEST COPY AVAILABLE

APPENDIX B

PROPOSED OPERATIONAL PARAMETERS RELATED TO STATEWIDE AND COMMON INSTITUTIONAL INDICATORS

Overview

During the process of developing the final recommendations on statewide and common institutional performance indicators, it became clear to Committee members that having a set of suggested operational parameters for the indicators would be extremely beneficial, not only in terms of Committee discussions, but also in clarifying Committee intent on these indicators for the public input process. The approach adopted by the Committee has been that goal-setting and reporting for any indicator should be at the highest, meaningful level of aggregation. Institutions are encouraged to track indicators at more refined levels of aggregation as needed for internal monitoring and use. Suggested operational parameters are presented for a majority of the potential indicators, including the following:

- Source of Data
- Suggested Measurement Approach
- Suggested Measurement Timeframe

Suggested parameters are not included for the "Effective practice" indicators given their non-quantitative nature.

Goal 1: Economic Growth

Statewide Indicators

Satisfaction of Illinois Business and Industry With Illinois Higher Education

Source of Data: Periodic surveys at state level.

Suggested Measurement Approach: Report on degree of satisfaction of Illinois business and industry regarding the following:

- Satisfaction with new hires that are Illinois college and university graduates on their knowledge and abilities in substantive areas (e.g., accounting, engineering) as well as communication skills and work ethic.

- Satisfaction with services received from Illinois colleges and universities in the areas of technical assistance, training/education for current employees, and research partnerships.

Suggested Measurement Timeframe: Periodic.

Annual Sponsored Research Expenditures

Source of Data: National Science Foundation's (NSF) annual "Science and Engineering Indicators" report.

Suggested Measurement Approach: Aggregate research and development (R&D) expenditures by Illinois colleges and universities from the following sources of funds: Federal government, Non-federal government, and Industry. Dollars reported both in total and as a percent of U.S. total R&D expenditures from these fund sources.

Suggested Measurement Timeframe: Multi-year trend – most recent one-, two-, and five-year changes (number, percent, and change in proportion).

Annual Number of Graduates By Level and Broad Field of Study

Source of Data: IPEDS (Illinois reporting, Table Z)

Suggested Measurement Approach: Aggregate degrees awarded throughout the state, and report on the statewide totals by broad field of study within each level.

Above completions to be reported as number and proportion of total according to:

- Level: Pre-baccalaureate, Baccalaureate, and Post-baccalaureate
- Fields of Study: Agriculture, Business, Education, Engineering, Health Sciences, All other

Suggested Measurement Timeframe: Multi-year trend - most recent one-, two-, and five-year changes (number and percent).

Common Institutional Indicators

Percent of Degree/Certificate Recipients Either Employed or Enrolled in Further Education Within One Year of Graduation

Source of Data: Periodic alumni surveys by institutions; Illinois Community College System Occupational Follow-up Study.

Suggested Measurement Approach: Summary of questions on employment status and education status one year after graduation. Numerator is the number of alumni respondents either employed in a related field (full- or part-time) OR enrolled in further education (full- or part-time). Denominator is total number of alumni respondents.

Suggested Measurement Timeframe: Will vary by institutions with the cycle of their alumni follow-up surveys.

Goal 2: Partnerships with P-12 Education

Statewide Indicators

Annual Number of Students Completing Requirements for Initial Teacher Certification by Race/Ethnicity and Gender, by Certificate Area

Source of Data: Institutions/ISBE (summed from common institutional indicator 2C1).

Suggested Measurement Approach: Aggregated headcount of potential new teachers from all Illinois colleges and universities with teacher education programs. The population includes all baccalaureate graduates in teacher education programs, plus others completing requirements for initial teacher certification with or without a degree being awarded. Certificate areas are aggregated as follows:

- Early Childhood Education
- Elementary
- Secondary
- Special Education

Race/Ethnicity categories include the following:

- Black, Non-Hispanic
- Hispanic
- All others

Suggested Measurement Timeframe: Multi-year trend - most recent one-, two-, and five-year changes (number and percent).

Common Institutional Indicators

Annual Number of Students Completing Requirements for Initial Teacher Certification by Certificate Area

Source of Data: Institution/ISBE.

Suggested Measurement Approach: Only reported by institutions with teacher education programs. The population includes all baccalaureate graduates in teacher education programs, plus others completing requirements for initial teacher certification with or without a degree being awarded. Certificate areas are aggregated as follows:

- Early Childhood Education
- Elementary
- Secondary
- Special Education

Suggested Measurement Timeframe: Multi-year trend - most recent one-, two-, and five-year changes (number and percent).

Goal 3: Affordability

Statewide Indicators

Average Undergraduate Tuition and Fees vs. Illinois Per Capita Disposable Income (by sector)

Source of Data: Illinois Student Assistance Commission (ISAC) Data Books and IBHE staff estimates.

Suggested Measurement Approach: Annual percentage change of average undergraduate tuition and fees at public universities, community colleges, and private institutions vs. the percentage change in the Illinois per capita disposable income.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Suggested Measurement Timeframe: Multi-year trend - most recent one-, two-, and five-year changes.

Proportion of Undergraduate Students who Receive Financial Aid by Type of Aid and Overall (by sector)

Source of Data: Annual Illinois Student Financial Aid Survey; Fall Enrollment Survey.

Suggested Measurement Approach: The unduplicated headcount of undergraduate financial aid recipients by aid type (i.e., gift assistance, loans, employment, and total) as a percent of unduplicated annual undergraduate headcount enrollment at public universities, community colleges, and private institutions.

Suggested Measurement Timeframe: Multi-year trend - most recent one-, two-, and five-year changes.

Net Price of Attendance for Undergraduates Who Receive Aid By Income Quintile, After MAP, Pell, and Institutional Grant Awards are Subtracted (by sector)

Source of Data: ISAC, Institutional sources, U.S. Census Bureau.

Suggested Measurement Approach: Calculation of the average net price to undergraduates which reflects the total cost of attendance for students at public universities, community colleges, and private institutions as determined by the institution for use in making financial aid awards to undergraduates, including tuition and fees, housing (e.g., room and board), transportation, books, and supplies. Income is defined as the gross income from all sources for Illinois families with no related subfamilies as reported by the U.S. Bureau of the Census in the annual March supplement to the Current Population Survey (CPS). The family income distribution for all Illinois families is divided into quintile ranges, with mean incomes calculated for each quintile.

Suggested Measurement Timeframe: Multi-year trend - most recent one-, two-, and five-year changes.

Common Institutional Indicators

Net Price of Attendance for Undergraduates Who Receive Aid By Income Quintile, After MAP, Pell, and Institutional Grant Awards are Subtracted

Source of Data: ISAC, Institutional sources.

Suggested Measurement Approach: Calculation of the average net price to undergraduates which reflects the total cost of attendance for students at public universities, community colleges, and private institutions as determined by the institution for use in making financial aid awards to undergraduates, including tuition and fees, housing (e.g., room and board), transportation, books, and supplies. Income is defined as the gross income from all sources for Illinois families with no related subfamilies as reported by the U.S. Bureau of the Census in the annual March supplement to the Current Population Survey (CPS). The family income distribution for all Illinois families is divided into quintile ranges, with mean incomes calculated for each quintile.[13]

[13] Note: Each institution will use the same set of income quintile ranges for Illinois families to be provided by the IBHE staff.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Suggested Measurement Timeframe: Multi-year trend - most recent one-, two-, and five-year changes.

Goal 4: Access and Diversity

Statewide Indicators

Completions by Race/Ethnicity, Disability Status, and Gender (by level and sector)

Source of Data: IPEDS (Illinois reporting, Table Z), Underrepresented Groups Report.

Suggested Measurement Approach: Aggregate degrees awarded throughout the state according to:

- Race/ethnicity: Black, Non-Hispanic; Hispanic; All others
- Disability status: Disabled; Not disabled
- Gender: Male; Female

Above completions to be reported as number and proportion of total according to:

- Level: Pre-baccalaureate, Baccalaureate, and Post-baccalaureate
- Sector: Public universities, Community colleges, Private institutions

Suggested Measurement Timeframe: Multi-year trend – most recent one-, two-, and five-year changes.

Common Institutional Indicators

Completions by Race/Ethnicity, Disability Status, and Gender (by level)

Source of Data: IPEDS (Illinois reporting, Table Z), Underrepresented Groups Report.

Suggested Measurement Approach: Aggregate degrees awarded by the institution according to:

- Race/ethnicity: Black, Non-Hispanic; Hispanic; All others
- Disability status: Disabled; Not disabled
- Gender: Male; Female

Above completions to be reported as number and proportion of total according to:

- Level: Pre-baccalaureate, Baccalaureate, and Post baccalaureate

Suggested Measurement Timeframe: Multi-year trend – most recent one-, two-, and five-year changes.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Goal 5: High Quality

Statewide Indicators

State Level Results from Illinois' Participation in the National Forum on College-Level Learning Pilot Project on Assessment of College Student Learning (*available in 2004*)

Sources of Data: The National Forum on College-Level Learning is an initiative funded by the Pew Charitable Trusts to explore the feasibility and utility of collecting data on student learning outcomes on a statewide basis for purposes of national benchmarking at the state level. Five states are currently involved in this pilot project – Illinois, Kentucky, New Mexico, Oklahoma, and South Carolina. The project has two main components. The first requires project staff to assemble and analyze data on existing certification/licensing and graduate school admissions examinations administered to college graduates (or soon-to-be graduates) on a widespread basis. These examinations may include tests typically given to two-year college graduates (e.g. the Physical Therapy Assistant examination) or to baccalaureate graduates (e.g. the Graduate Management Admissions Test).

The second component calls for participating states to collect data from a sample of currently-enrolled college students and recent college graduates. The project staff plans to administer three instruments during the fall of 2003. A sample of students at two-year colleges will take a number of the ACT Work Keys examinations. A similar sample of students at four-year institutions (both public and private) will take a battery of instruments developed through the RAND/CAE "Value-Added" project. The Community College Survey of Student Engagement (CCSSE) and the National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE) will be co-administered with each of these examinations respectively. Finally, a sample of recent graduates of four-year colleges (and possibly two-year colleges as well) will complete an alumni survey called the Collegiate Results Survey (CRS) administered on-line by *Peterson's Guide*.

Suggested Measurement Approach: To be determined by the project team. At this point, testing will likely be limited to somewhere between 1,200 and 2,000 students per state for each of the two test batteries, and for approximately 1,500 recent graduates per state for the CRS. This will necessitate using a cluster sampling approach for each state in which a sample of institutions is first drawn, then a sample of students from each institution so identified.

Suggested Measurement Timeframe: The most recent 3 years' worth of data available for the first component (existing tests) and the results from the second component.

Common Institutional Indicators

Extent to Which Institutional Quality and Effectiveness are Recognized by Graduates

Sources of Data: Illinois Community College System Occupational Follow-up Study (one year) and Baccalaureate Follow-up Study (one, five, and nine years).

Suggested Measurement Approach: The information will be presented as the percentage of respondents who indicated that they were satisfied (Very Satisfied/Satisfied or Strongly Positive/Positive/Somewhat Positive) as indicated on responses to relevant questions on these surveys.

Potential Baccalaureate Follow-up Study Satisfaction Questions

Rating Scale 1. Strongly positive; 2. Positive; 3. Somewhat positive; 4. Somewhat negative; 5. Negative; 6. Strongly negative

What is your present attitude towards the University (Campus)?
What is your present attitude towards your bachelor's degree major?
Professors were accessible?
Professors had high expectations?
Professors emphasize study/planning?
Professors provided timely feedback?
Students expected to work cooperatively?
Students encouraged to challenge ideas?
Professors used appropriate teaching activities?

Potential Occupational Follow-up Study Satisfaction Questions

Rating Scale 1. Very dissatisfied; 2. Somewhat dissatisfied; 3. Somewhat satisfied; 4. Very satisfied; Blank - No response to this item; 0 - Did not use (for services).

Satisfaction with Program Components and Other Courses
Content of Program Skills Courses (Survey Item 10a ,11a):
Lecture, Lab Experience (Survey Item 10b, 11b):
Equipment, Facilities, and Materials (Survey Item 10c, 11c):
Job Preparation (Survey Item 10d, 11d)
Preparation for Further Education (Survey Item 10e, 11e)
Information on Current Employment (Survey Item 10f)

Satisfaction with Services
Financial Aid (Survey Item 12a):
Academic Advising (Survey Item 12b):
Career Planning (Survey Item 12c):
College Transfer Planning (Survey Item 12d):
Counseling (Survey Item 12e):
Tutoring (Survey Item 12f):
Library/Audio Visual (Survey Item 12g):
Student Activities (Survey Item 12h):

Suggested Measurement Timeframe: Most recent two surveys for each sector.

Pass Rates on Professional/Occupational Licensure Exams Relative to State and/or National Averages

Source of Data: Illinois Department of Professional Regulations (IDPR), Institutional sources.

Suggested Measurement Approach: The initial emphasis will be on the pass rate of graduates in selected professional/occupational programs that are licensed/registered/regulated by the Illinois Department of Professional Regulations (IDPR). Additional data will be gathered from the Illinois Board of Admissions to the Bar for attorneys. Pass rate information will correspond with the methodology in place for the licensing entity. Generally, the rate will be calculated for each designated specialty program with the calculation based on the number of graduates who pass the test as a percentage of those who took the test. IDPR data are most available for individuals in

healthcare fields. Pass rates will be presented relative to state and/or national exam averages.

Proposed Fields: Universities – Law, Medicine, Dentistry, Nursing (RN), Engineering, and Accounting.
Community Colleges – Emergency Medical Technician, Medical Radiologic Technician, Dental Hygienist, and Nursing (RN).

Suggested Measurement Timeframe: Most recent two years of results for each sector.

Goal 6: Productivity and Accountability

Statewide Indicators

Cost of Instruction per Credit Hour by Student Level (sector averages)

Source of Data: Illinois Board of Higher Education Discipline Cost Study; Illinois Community College Board Unit Cost Study

Suggested Measurement Approach: The methodologies established and used in the Illinois Community College Board Unit Cost Study and the Illinois Board of Higher Education Comparative Cost Study will be followed in this analysis. For community colleges, this will be the net instructional unit cost that includes the direct and indirect costs for instruction. For universities, this will be the total instructional cost with university overheads excluding O&M physical plant costs. For trend analysis, the figures will be adjusted for inflation using the Higher Education Price Index (HEPI).

Levels: Community College Level – Undergraduate Lower Division.
University Student Levels - Undergraduate Lower Division, Undergraduate Upper Division, Graduate I and Graduate II.

Suggested Measurement Timeframe: Multi-year trend - most recent one-, two-, and five-year changes.

Proportion of First-time, Full-time Freshmen who Complete their Degree Within 150 percent of Catalog Time, or are Still Enrolled or Transferred (sector ranges)

Source of Data: IPEDS Graduation Rate Survey institutional responses.

Suggested Measurement Approach: An entering cohort of first-time, full-time freshmen is identified and tracked to determine those who complete degrees or certificates within 150% of published catalog (normal) time, or are still enrolled, or have transferred. The general methodology follows the Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System (IPEDS) Graduation Rate Survey (GRS) methodology. The numerator is the number of individuals in the cohort who graduate, transfer, or are still enrolled at the end of the observation period (3 years for community colleges or 6 years for universities). The denominator is first-time, full-time freshmen in the designated fiscal year.

Data are presented as the minimum and maximum of the range for community colleges and public universities separately as well as the median value for each sector.

Suggested Measurement Timeframe: First-time, full-time freshmen in Fall 1997 (FY 1998) for community colleges and Fall 1995 (FY 1996) for universities. The community college entering cohort is tracked for three years. The university entering cohort is tracked for six years.

Administrative and Support Cost per Credit Hour (sector averages)

Source of Data: Illinois Board of Higher Education Cost Study; Illinois Community College Board Unit Cost Study.

Suggested Measurement Approach: The methodologies established and used in the Illinois Community College Board Unit Cost Study and the Illinois Board of Higher Education Comparative Cost Study will be followed in this analysis. For community colleges, this includes the indirect instructional support areas unit costs. For universities, this includes academic support, student services, and institutional support unit costs. Figures used should exclude operational costs of the physical plant. Fixed costs should also be excluded. For trend analysis, the figures will be adjusted for inflation using the Higher Education Price Index (HEPI).

Suggested Measurement Timeframe: Multi-year trend - most recent one-, two-, and five-year changes.

Common Institutional Indicators

Cost of Instruction per Credit Hour by Student Level

Source of Data: Illinois Board of Higher Education Discipline Cost Study; Illinois Community College Board Unit Cost Study.

Suggested Measurement Approach: The methodologies established and used in the Illinois Community College Board Unit Cost Study and the Illinois Board of Higher Education Comparative Cost Study will be followed in this analysis. For community colleges, this will be the net instructional unit cost that includes the direct and indirect costs for instruction. For universities, this will be the total instructional cost with university overheads excluding O&M physical plant costs. For trend analysis, the figures will be adjusted for inflation using the Higher Education Price Index (HEPI).

Present data as a percentage of the state weighted average unit cost by level as well as a dollar amount. For trend analysis, the figures will be adjusted for inflation using the Higher Education Price Index (HEPI).

Levels: Community College Levels – Undergraduate Lower Division.
University Student Levels - Undergraduate Lower Division, Undergraduate Upper Division, Graduate I and Graduate II.

Suggested Measurement Timeframe: Multi-year trend - most recent one-, two-, and five-year changes.

Proportion of First-time, Full-time Freshmen who Complete their Degree Within 150 percent of Normal Time, or are Still Enrolled or Transferred

Source of Data: Institutional IPEDS Graduation Rate Survey data.

Suggested Measurement Approach: An entering cohort of first-time, full-time freshmen is identified and tracked to determine those who complete degrees or certificates within 150% of published catalog (normal) time, or are still enrolled, or have transferred. The general methodology follows the IPEDS Graduation Rate Survey (GRS) methodology. The numerator is the number of individuals in the cohort who graduate, transfer, or are still enrolled at the end of the observation period (3 years for community colleges or 6 years for universities). The denominator is first-time, full-time freshmen in the designated fiscal year.

Suggested Measurement Timeframe: First-time, full-time freshmen in Fall 1997 (FY 1998) for community colleges and Fall 1995 (FY 1996) for universities. The community college entering cohort is tracked for three years. The university entering cohort is tracked for six years.

Administrative and Support Cost per Credit Hour and as a Percent of the Sector Average

Source of Data: Illinois Board of Higher Education Cost Study; Illinois Community College Board Unit Cost Study.

Suggested Measurement Approach: Calculate the average administrative and support cost per credit hour and also show as a percent of the sector average (see indicator 6S3). The methodologies established and used in the Illinois Community College Board Unit Cost Study and the Illinois Board of Higher Education Discipline Cost Study will be followed in this analysis. For community colleges, this includes the indirect instructional support areas' unit costs. For universities, this includes academic support, student services, and institutional support unit costs. Figures used should exclude operational costs of the physical plant. Fixed costs should also be excluded. For trend analysis, the cost per credit hour figures will be adjusted for inflation using the Higher Education Price Index (HEPI).

Suggested Measurement Timeframe: Multi-year trend - most recent one-, two-, and five-year changes.

U.S. Department of Education
Office of Educational Research and Improvement (OERI)
National Library of Education (NLE)
Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC)

NOTICE

Reproduction Basis

☑ This document is covered by a signed "Reproduction Release (Blanket)" form (on file within the ERIC system), encompassing all or classes of documents from its source organization and, therefore, does not require a "Specific Document" Release form.

☐ This document is Federally-funded, or carries its own permission to reproduce, or is otherwise in the public domain and, therefore, may be reproduced by ERIC without a signed Reproduction Release form (either "Specific Document" or "Blanket").